REMARKS

Applicants have now had an opportunity to carefully consider the Examiner's comments set forth in the Office Action of April 21, 2005.

The Office Action

The Examiner rejected claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,738,155 to Rosenlund.

Claims 7 and 19 are canceled. Therefore, claims 1-6, 8-18 and 20-22 remain in the application.

The Claims are Patentably Distinguished Over the Cited Reference

In Applicant's October 26, 2004 communication, Applicant provided an argument on page 9 attempting to distinguish claim 10 from the cited art.

In the April 21, 2005 Office Action, no comments regarding this argument were set forth. Applicant notified the Examiner of this situation. The Examiner acknowledged this argument was not addressed, but stated other comments set forth in the Office Action of April 21, 2005 addressed the argument.

Applicant respectfully traverses this position.

The previous argument regarding claim 10 is set forth below:

> In addressing claim 10, it is suggested that the hierarchical storage management (HSM) system meets the limitation of prescanning the publication data for verifying the potential pathname. However, the HSM system, as a hierarchical system already containing a table (i.e. the HFD – see col. 14, lines 37-40) of known locations of files, has no need to prescan a potential pathname to verify that it is correct. The HSM system already knows the pathname is correct. Therefore, the HSM system provides no prescanning or verification of potential pathnames.
>
> In contrast, claim 10 includes the limitation of prescanning the publication data for verifying the potential pathname. This feature, as described and claimed, is not present in Roselund. As such, claim 10 is patentably distinct from Roselund, and should be allowed. Moreover, since claims 11-15 depend on claim 10, claims 11-15 are

7

also in condition for allowance.

As noted, no discussion was provided which disputed the arguments set forth above. Rather, on page 5 of the Office Action, a statement from the previous Office Action is repeated, wherein it is stated Rosenlund et al. discloses "prescanning the publication data for verifying the potential pathname . . .." There is no discussion as to the location of such a teaching in Rosenlund et al. In other places in the Office Action, such as with reference to claim 7, it is stated that Rosenlund et al. includes "prescanning the data stream for verifying the image exists at the location (please note column 18, lines 34-60)." With regard to claim 19, it is stated the Rosenlund et al. patent teaches the "processing device prescans data corresponding to the high resolution version of the image (please note column 11, lines 24-31)."

With attention to the citation in Rosenlund et al. at column 18, lines 34-60, it is stated therein:

> In block **1706**, to locate a file, the user will select the search icon which executes the Java search sub-routine. When the search routine is executed, the Java applet communicates with central service facility **105** to identify the mode of operation of the browser. In response to the request for a search, **DCM** server **132** queries the user profile, and determines which tables and which attributes of those tables, that the end user is permitted to see and/or search on. In block **1708**, the names of these attributes are transmitted to the end user's browser and are displayed on the screen of the end user's workstation in the form of a user selectable list box. In block **1710**, the user selects one or more attributes on which he would like to search, as shown in **FIG. 12**, and selects an on-screen icon to perform the search. For example, in **FIG. 12**, the user has selected the attribute **1202** named "File Name" on which the search had indicated by the check mark next to the attribute name in the pull-down list box **1204**. In an adjacent list box **1206**, the Java search applet displays a plurality of search relationships, relating the attribute in DCM database **132** to be searched with a particular variable. In this case, the search relationship is "contains". Other relationships include but are not limited to "greater than" or "less than" which are typically used with metadata having numeric attributes, and "before" and "after" which are commonly used with metadata attributes containing time or date

8

Aug. 31. 2005 4:46PM   Fay Sharpe   No. 4501   P. 11

Atty. Dkt. No. A0625-US-NP
XERZ 2 00383

values, as well as "starts with", and "ends with" which
indicate a particular location in an attribute value.

And with regard to claim 19, the section of Rosenlund et al. cited (column 11,
lines 24-31) states:

> At step **610**, a client, such as, end user facility **300**,
> provides digital files or transparencies for scanning to
> central service facility **105**. At step **615**, central service
> facility **105** stores high resolution image files (e.g., graphics
> files) on server **110** and generates low resolution image
> files. At step **620**, central service facility **105** logs files into
> **DCM** system **130**. The client builds page layout using, for
> example, desktop computer **320** at step **625**.

From a review of these sections, the only reference to scanning appears in
column 11, line 26. However, this scanning has nothing to do with the claimed
prescanning of the present application. Particularly, the language in claims 7, 10
and 19 are provided for a prescanning which acts to verify that an image exists at
the intended location, *i.e.*, verifying the potential pathname of the publication data,
and where it prescans data which corresponds to the high resolution version of the
image.

The scanning reference in Rosenlund is, in the first instance, not a
prescanning operation which identifies potential paths and/or ensure the document
is at a certain location. Rather, scanning is just taking digital files or transparencies
so that they may be scanned to a central service facility. This has nothing to do with
the concepts as claimed in the present application.

Thus, Applicant respectfully traverses that these sections of Rosenlund et al.
teach or fairly suggest the prescanning concepts found in claims 7, 10 or 19.
Applicant has canceled claims 7 and 19, and included that language into the
corresponding independent claims 1 and 16, respectively.

9

CONCLUSION

For the reasons detailed above, it is submitted all claims remaining in the application (Claims 1-6, 8-18 and 20-22) are now in condition for allowance. An early notice to that effect is therefore earnestly solicited.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he/she is hereby authorized to call Mark Svat, at Telephone Number (216) 861-5582.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,
MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

8|31|05
_____
Date

_____
Mark Svat
Reg. No. 34,261
1100 Superior Avenue, 7th Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579
(216) 861-5582

N:\XERZ\200383\KMF0005991V001.doc

10